

राजस्व विभाग

युद्ध जागीर

दिनांक 17 जून, 1980

क्रमांक 821-ज(I)-80/21081.—पूर्वी पंजाब युद्ध पुरस्कार अधिनियम, 1948 (जैसा कि उसे हरियाणा राज्य में अपनाया गया है और उस में आज तक संशोधन किया गया है) की घारा 2(ए) (ए) तथा 3(ए) के अनुसार सौंपे गये अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए हरियाणा के राज्यपाल निम्नलिखित व्यक्तियों को वार्षिक कीमत वाली युद्ध जागीर उनके नाम के सामने दी गई फसल तथा राशि एवं सनद में दी गई शर्तों के अनुसार सहर्ष प्रदान करते हैं :—

क्रमांक	दिला	जागीर पाने वाले का नाम	गांव व पत्ता	तहसील	फसल/वर्ष जब से जागीर दी गई	वार्षिक राशि
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	नारनील	श्री गिरधारी लाल, पुत्र श्री चिरंजी लाल	भंडौर	रिवाड़ी	रबी, 1977 से खरीफ, 1979 तक रबी, 1980 से	रुपये 150 300
2	"	श्री धीरा राम, पुत्र गिरधारी लाल	चिमनावास	"	खरीफ, 1975 से खरीफ, 1979 तक रबी, 1980 से	रुपये 150 300

क्रमांक 831-ज(I)-80/21085.—पूर्वी पंजाब युद्ध पुरस्कार अधिनियम, 1948 (जैसा कि उसे हरियाणा राज्य में अपनाया गया है और उसमें आज तक संशोधन किया गया है) की घारा 2(ए)(1) तथा 3(1) के अनुसार सौंपे गये अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए हरियाणा के राज्यपाल श्री भगत सिंह, पुत्र श्री फतेह सिंह, गांव नसड़ीली, तहसील नारायणगढ़ जिला अम्बाला, को रबी, 1976 से खरीफ 1979 तक 150 रुपये वार्षिक तथा रबी, 1980 से 300 रुपये वार्षिक कीमत वाली युद्ध जागीर सनद में दी गई शर्तों के अनुसार सहर्ष प्रदान करते हैं।

दिनांक 18 जून, 1980

क्रमांक 830-ज(I)-80/21212.—पूर्वी पंजाब युद्ध पुरस्कार अधिनियम, 1948 (जैसा कि उसे हरियाणा राज्य में अपनाया गया है और उसमें आज तक संशोधन किया गया है) की घारा 2(ए)(ए) तथा 3(ए) के अनुसार सौंपे गये अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए हरियाणा के राज्यपाल निम्नलिखित व्यक्तियों को वार्षिक कीमत वाली युद्ध जागीर उनके नाम के सामने दी गई फसल तथा राशि एवं सनद में दी गई शर्तों के अनुसार सहर्ष प्रदान करते हैं :—

क्रमांक	दिला	जागीर पाने वाले का नाम	गांव व पत्ता	तहसील	फसल/वर्ष जब से जागीर दी गई	वार्षिक राशि
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	अम्बाला	ओम प्रकाश, पुत्र मोतीबन	क्वाटर नं० 21, नन्हेड़ा	अम्बाला	खरीफ, 1965 से रबी, 1970 तक खरीफ, 1970 से खरीफ, 1979 तक रबी, 1980 से	रुपये 100 150 300

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2	अम्बाला	पार कौर, विधवा, केसर सिंह	तेपला	अम्बाला	खरीफ, 1974 से खरीफ, 1979 तक	रुपये
	"				रबी, 1980 से	150
3	"	गुरमुख सिंह, पुत्र लेहना सिंह	रजौली	"	रबी, 1973 से खरीफ, 1979 तक	300
4	"	टैहल सिंह, पुत्र देवा सिंह	हंमीदपुर	नारायणगढ़	रबी, 1977 से खरीफ, 1979 तक	150
					रबी, 1980 से	300
5	"	सामराज, पुत्र दया राम	मुलाना	अम्बाला	रबी, 1973 से खरीफ, 1979 तक	150
					रबी, 1980 से	300
6	"	मिलखा सिंह, पुत्र आत्मा सिंह	रजौली	"	रबी, 1973 से खरीफ, 1979 तक	150
					रबी, 1980 से	300

रघुनाथ जोशी,
विशेष कार्य अधिकारी, हरियाणा सरकार,
राजस्व विभाग।

LABOUR DEPARTMENT

The 26th June, 1980

No. 11(112)-80-3Lab/8250.—In pursuance of provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s. Tiger Locks Limited, Plot No. 3 Industrial Estate, Palam, Gurgaon Road, Gurgaon.

BEFORE SHRI J. P. CHAUDHRY, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA,
FARIDABAD

Reference No. 14 of 1980

between

SHRI RAM PAT, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S TIGER LOCKS LIMITED,
PLOT NO. 3, INDUSTRIAL ESTATE PALAM, GURGAON ROAD, GURGAON

Present :—

Shri Ram Pat, workman with Shri R. N. Roy.

Shri N. P. Gupta, for the management.

AWARD

This reference No. 14 of 1980 has been referred to this court by the Hon'ble Governor of Haryana.—
vid his order No. ID/GG/70-79/964, dated 9th January, 1980 under section 10 (i) (c) of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for adjudication of the dispute existing between Shri Ram Pat workman and the management



of M/s Tiger Locks Limited, Plot No. 3, Industrial Estate, Palam Gurgaon Road, Gurgaon. The term of the reference was :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Ram Pat was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

After receiving this reference notices were issued to both the parties and both the parties appeared before this court through their authorised representative. On the pleadings of the parties, the following issues were framed on 29th February, 1980 :—

1. Whether the reference is bad in law?
2. Whether the dispute in this reference is not an Industrial Dispute? If not, to what effect?
3. Whether the workman abandoned his service of his own, If so, to what effect?
4. Whether the termination of the services of the workman is justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?
5. Relief.

The case was fixed for the evidence of the parties for 25th March, 1980. On 25th March, both the parties prayed for adjournment because the evidence was not present and the case was fixed for 24th April, 1980, 13th May, 1980, 30th May, 1980 and 13th June, 1980. On 13th June, 1980 the workman Shri Ram Pat made a statement in this court that he has mutually settled his dispute with the respondent management and has also received a sum of Rs. 2000 (Rs. Two Thousand only) from the management. He further stated that he has also foregone the right of re-instatement or re-employment with the management. He has also stated that now there is no dispute left with the management.

In these circumstances, I thus relying on the statement of Shri Ram Pat workman hold that the demand raised by the workman against the management leading to this reference has been duly satisfied. There is now no dispute remains to be adjudicated between the parties, therefore, I give my award accordingly. No order as to costs. So this award is in answer of this reference.

I. P. CHAUDHARY,

Dated 13th June, 1980.

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Faridabad.

Endorsement No. 989, dated 20th June, 1980.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

I. P. CHAUDHARY,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 11(112)-80-3Lab/8251.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Tiger Locks Limited, Plot No. 3, Industrial Estate, Palam Gurgaon Road, Gurgaon.

BEFORE SHRI I. P. CHAUDHARY, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA,
FARIDABAD

Reference No. 13 of 1980

between

SHRI PANCHU GOPAL NASKAR, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S TIGER LOCKS LIMITED, PLOT NO. 3, INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, PALAM GURGAON ROAD, GURGAON

Present :—

Shri Panchu Gopal Naskar, workman with Shri R. N. Roy.

Shri N. P. Gupta, for the management.

AWARD

This reference No. 13 of 1980 has been referred to this court by the Hon'ble Governor of Haryana, vide his order No. ID/GG/68-79/958, dated 9th January, 1980 under section 10 (i) (c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, for adjudication of the dispute existing between Shri Panchu Gopal Naskar, workman and the management of M/s Tiger Looks Limited, Plot No. 3, Industrial Estate, Palam Gurdon Road, Gurgaon. The term of the reference was :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Panchu Gopal Naskar was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

After receiving this reference notices were issued to both the parties and both the parties appeared before this court through their authorised representatives. On the pleadings of the parties, the following issues were framed on 29th February, 1980 :—

1. Whether the reference is bad in law?
2. Whether the dispute in their reference is not an Industrial Disputes? If not, to what effect?
3. Whether the workman abandoned his service of his own? If so to what effect?
4. Whether the termination of the services of the workman is justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?
5. Relief.

The case was fixed for the evidence of the parties for 25th March, 1980. On 25th March, 1980 both the parties prayed for adjournment because the evidence was not present and the case was fixed for 24th April, 1980, 13th May, 1980, 30th May, 1980 and 13th June, 1980. On 13th June, 1980 the workman Shri Panchu Gopal Naskar made a statement in this court that he has mutually settled his dispute with the respondent management and has also received a sum of Rs. 2000 (Rs. Two Thousand only) from the management. He further stated that he has also foregone the right of re-instatement or re-employment with the management. He has also stated that now there is no dispute left with the management.

In these circumstances, I thus relying on the statement of Shri Panchu Gopal Naskar workman hold that the demand raised by the workman against the management leading to this reference has been duly satisfied. There is now no dispute remains to be adjudicated between the parties, therefore, I give my award accordingly. No order as to costs. So this award is in answer of this reference.

Dated 13th June, 1980.

I. P. CHAUDHARY,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Faridabad.

Endorsement No. 988, dated 20th June, 1980.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, of Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

I. P. CHAUDHARY,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Faridabad.

The 30th June, 1980

No. 11 (112)-80-3 Lah/8295.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s D. R. Kumar Brothers, Gurgaon.

BEFORE SHRI M. C. BHARDWAJ, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 301 of 1979
between

SHRI DESH BANDHU, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. D. R.
KUMAR BROTHERS, GURGAON

Present :—

Workman in person.

Shri Sudershan Kumar, for the management.

AWARD

1. By order No. GG/44-78/42016, dated 24th September, 1979 the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s. D. R. Kumar Brothers, Gurgaon and its workman Shri Desh Bandhu, to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (i) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Whether the termination of services of Shri Desh Bandhu was justified and in order? If no, to what relief is he entitled?

1. On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared and filed their pleadings. On the pleadings of the parties, issues were framed on 9th January, 1980. And the case was fixed for the evidence of the management. No evidence was produced by the management. They filed settlement dated 28th May, 1980 before the date fixed in the case. On the date fixed, neither parties was present. In the circumstances, I give my award that the dispute has been settled between the parties.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,

The 17th June, 1980

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 572, dated the 26th June 1980

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana Labour & Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 11(112)-80-3Lab/8296. In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Raina Group of Industries, Plot No. 84, New Industrial Area, Delhi Road, Gurgaon.

BEFORE SHRI M. C. BHARDWAJ, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No 27 of 1980

between

THE WORKMEN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. RAINA GROUP OF INDUSTRIES,
PLOT NO. 84, INDUSTRIAL AREA, DELHI ROAD, GURGAON.

Present :—Shri Shardha Nand, for the workmen.

Shri Naresh Sharma, for the management.

AWARD

1. By order No. ID/GGN/41-79/11494, dated 4th March, 1980, the Governor of Haryana referred the following disputes between the management of M/s. Raina Group of Industries, Plot No. 84, New Industrial Area, Delhi Road, Gurgaon and its workmen, to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :

1. Whether the workmen are entitled to the grant of bonus @20% for the years 1977-78 and 1978-79 ? If so, with what details ?
2. Whether the workmen should be issued appointment letters ? If so, with what details ?

2. On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The representative for the management appeared but the workmen were not present as the service was not effected on them. Then again notices were sent to the parties. Copies of settlement arrived at between the parties were received by this Tribunal by post. On the last date of hearing the representative for the workmen appeared but the management did not appear. The representative for the workmen made a statement that he withdrew the reference as a settlement has been arrived at between the parties. I, therefore, give my award in terms of the settlement. The settlement shall form part of the award.

Dated the 14th June, 1980.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 573, dated the 20th June, 1980.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

H. L. GUGNANI,

Secretary to Government, Haryana,
Labour and Employment, Departments.